

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JIN MYUNG, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

COLONIAL VAN LINES INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-02182-CDS-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 38]

Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion for Defendant Colonial Van Lines to deliver Plaintiffs' belongings from storage. Docket No. 38. Defendant Colonial Van Lines filed a response. Docket No. 39. Plaintiffs filed a reply. Docket No. 41. The Court does not require a hearing. *See Local Rule 7-2.*

Having reviewed Plaintiffs’ motion, it suffers from threshold deficiencies. First, the motion does not provide citations to any legal authority justifying the relief requested. *See Docket No. 38.* Instead, Plaintiffs state that they “respectfully ask the Court to compel Defendants to immediately deliver their belongings to the agreed destination and to award Plaintiffs their attorney’s fees incurred in bringing this Motion.” *Id.* at 3. Defendant contends that “Plaintiffs are asking the Court to grant summary judgment and make a determination that Plaintiffs are entitled to specific performance.” Docket No. 39 at 1. However, in reply, Plaintiffs submit that they did not bring a motion for summary judgment, but a motion for immediate equitable relief. *See Docket No. 41* at 3. Yet again, Plaintiffs fail to provide a citation to legal authority justifying the relief requested, beyond repeatedly asserting their entitlement to such relief. *See Docket Nos. 38, 41.*

Second, the three total cases that Plaintiffs cite to are unavailing given the relief requested. See Docket No. 38 at 4-5. Plaintiffs cite to *Johnson v. Bekins Van Lines Co.*, No. 2:20-cv-00747-

1 APG-DJA, 2021 WL 610216, at *3 (D. Nev. Feb. 16, 2021).¹ Docket No. 38 at 4. However, this
2 case involves judgment as a matter of law pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 50, which
3 is inapplicable here. *See id.* at 546. Further, the *Neptune Orient Lines, Ltd.* case discusses an
4 appeal of a motion for summary judgment, which is also unavailing given that Plaintiffs clearly
5 submit they “are not seeking summary judgment.” Docket No. 41 at 3. Additionally, the third
6 case cited, *Rent-A-Ctr., Inc. v. Canyon Television & Appliance Rental, Inc.*, 944 F.2d 597, 603
7 (9th Cir. 1991), discusses preliminary injunctive relief—which is also not the relief requested here.
8 *See* Docket No. 38 at 5. Moreover, the motion consists of less than three pages of argument and
9 is not well-developed, particularly given the significance of the relief being sought. Courts do not
10 address arguments that are presented without sufficiently developed argument. *See Kor Media*
11 *Grp., LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 582 n.3 (D. Nev. 2013).

12 Accordingly, the pending motion is **DENIED**. Docket No. 38.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: October 27, 2025

15 
16 Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

25
26 ¹ This case is not attributable to the provided case docket number nor the provided database
27 identifier and electronic report number. Case No. 2:20-cv-00747 in the District of Nevada is
28 actually *Egg and I, LLC et al v. U.S. Specialty Insurance Company et al.*, No. 2:20-cv-00747-KJD-
DJA. The case exists in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, with the citation:
Johnson v. Bekins Van Lines Co., 808 F. Supp. 545 (E.D. Tex. 1992), *aff'd*, 995 F.2d 221 (5th Cir.
1993).